



REDMOND PARK BOARD



Meeting Minutes June 2, 2005 Parks Maintenance Operations Center

The Park Board met at 6:30 p.m. to tour the Maintenance Operations Facility. Tour was given by Eric O'Neal, Park Operations Supervisor.

I. Call to order

The regular meeting of the Redmond Park Board was called to order by Chairperson Lori Snodgrass at 7:06 p.m.

Board members present: Chair: Snodgrass, Co-chair: Kelsey, Boardmembers: Margeson, Stewart; Youth Advocate, Zak.

Absent and Excused: Ladd and Youth Advocate, Jones

City staff present: Danny Hopkins, Parks and Recreation Director; and Sharon Sato, Recording Secretary.

II. Approval of Minutes

Motion for approval of the May 5, 2005 Redmond Park Board minutes with correction as follows:

Page 7 - Potential Alternative Funding Source - second sentence ...Study/Work session with Council - June 26 - corrected to Tuesday, June 28.

Motion by: Kelsey to adopt minutes as amended

Second by: Margeson

Motion carried: 4-0 unanimous

III. Items from the Audience

None

IV. Additions to the Agenda/Handouts

- A. Arts in the Parks Brochure (Handout) - FYI
- B. Wayfinding in Downtown Redmond (Handout) - more information to follow at July's Board meeting.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Rose Hill/Willows Neighborhood SWOT Assessment

Hopkins reported that there was no timeframe on approval for the assessment; however, the Board is requested to make comments, additions, and deletions. Staff has made some recommendations for consideration. Recommendations associated with neighborhood assessment would be considered in the future Park Improvement Plan reviews (PIP) (e.g. neighborhood park acquisition coordinating with school district, and PSE Trail planning and acquisition.) The bi-annual revision of the parks Recreation Open Space (PRO) may also reflect identified opportunities and strategies.

B. Hartman Park Field Opening Procedures - O'Neal

O'Neal summarized the daily operations of the Park Operations staff pertaining to field maintenance at Hartman.

- Two types of customers - users that pay (sign a contract) and non-paying users (high school, RBA, Redmond North, Redmond West and some select baseball teams). Those organizations sign an agreement yearly to perform maintenance on fields.
- Park Operations maintains: turf, irrigation systems, fences, buildings, restrooms, cleaning restrooms and hard surfaces.
- Most LL fields have been renovated.
- Current practice is - if LL infields are wet, a drying agent is applied - limits per field, per day, per year. The drying agent is a clay material that has extreme water absorbing properties. Problems arise from years of adding too much drying agent, when fields are saturated the fields become sponge like - too saturated -too much water, no water drain off.
- Staffing levels were historically higher than current levels. The current crew is specific to sports field maintenance and also work on Perrigo and GrassLawn, along with other assigned duties (restrooms, litter, garbage). Smaller staff than six to seven years ago. Amount

of available hours for maintenance crews are less - asking user groups to maintain their part of the use agreement.

- Volunteers are asked to organize a work party at the beginning of the season, Parks Dept. holds training - how to use tools, dry out fields, how to get fields ready to play.
- Last year turn out was good, but dry year, this year is wetter than average, poor turnout at training. Less qualified people to perform duties.
- Problem with rainout lines - working with technology staff to remedy problems and changing ways of delivering information.
- Working with citizens and leagues on ways to remedy problems. Hartman Park user group meetings, held from January to May, allow discussion on ways to help solve or improve problems.

Hopkins summarized that this has been an unusually wet spring; staff is looking at the current process, improve communications linkage. Continue to make changes in physical plan - eliminating the base cutouts at Hartman, accelerating the synthetic turf for Fields 5 & 6, drainage component for Field 2. Staff is working with LL organization to tap into County funding grant for field improvements. Parks staff is sensitive to the problems and evaluating organizational and management strategies to do a better job.

Stewart stated that she has attended the field preparation course at the beginning of the season. She noted that sometimes field concerns are best resolved by being left alone, inexperienced workers can cause damage. Sometimes volunteers are not aware of the commitment. More consistent commitment may be achieved by better training/teaching of volunteers. She also added that when we see things that can be done to better to maximize playing time, we need to utilize that.

Hopkins stated that he felt there was a good interim plan now to close this gap and as land becomes more expensive and, less athletic fields built in the future, technology and maintenance strategies designed to maximize use will become increasingly important. He also added that an opportunity study or Master Plan update needs to be considered for the site.

Kelsey also added that he would rather see the City maintain those fields as much as possible and if the leagues have the funds to contribute, instead of labor, that fees be added or increased. More or higher fees would make it

possible to add more staff to do the work. Untrained staff could possibly do more damage. Kelsey would like staff to look into this.

Snodgrass commended staff for their responsiveness toward listening and working with user groups. She added that it is difficult to increase fees for user groups that have a passion and an involvement, in the giving of time in lieu of compensation. She added that, if the leagues had sufficient funds, discussions with the City could explore hiring a staff person for the season.

C. Park Ballot Measure - Council Recommendation

The sub-committee, consisting of Seth, Sue and Tim, met and developed an original draft. The content of the original draft did not change, input from the sub-committee was added into the preliminary draft and some wordsmithing, adding, "additional voter approved funding mechanism", removing the word "alternative".

Hopkins requested the Board recommend that staff wordsmith the document without changing any content and give to Park Board Chair for final approval prior to June 28th, to present to the Council at their June 28th meeting.

Kelsey suggested that the Board look at the suggested amount. He added that the amount was based on what voters indicated they would support.

Holly Placket, Redmond resident - inquired if the amount in the written report was the amount that would be recommended, by the Board, to go forward for Council recommendation. Snodgrass responded that his amount was to go forward to Council at their June 28th Study Session. Placket continued inquiring if the \$8.5 million included the Maintenance and Operations funding. Snodgrass responded, that it did not and that the \$880,000, for M&O was separate. Placket strongly felt the amount of \$8.5 million was too low and the amount should be raised. She added that there was a great need in this city for the funds. Based on the assessed value of the city, 46,000 residents - 24,000 registered voters, Placket felt a much higher figure should be aimed for.

Snodgrass responded that the Board's responsibility is to research and put forth the best funding mechanism recommendation to shore up and expand the budget that Parks are given for projects and put forth to City Council that information, for recommendation. When Council has reviewed that

information and recommendation, they make the final decision as to whether or not a measure will go forward.

Snodgrass strongly encouraged any citizen to step forward and speak their concerns or suggestions as to dollar amounts or recommendations. Snodgrass added that during the many times this measure has been presented, at Board meetings during the past three years, only a handful of citizens have stepped forward to speak on this issue. The Board has relied on the results of the survey, contact with other jurisdictions, and consultant's conclusion as to how to proceed.

Placket noted that a citizen's advisory committee would ultimately put the campaign together; however, the Council will weigh heavily on the Board's recommendation for a decision. Placket suggested that the Council may cut any dollar amount suggested by the Board, so the Board should go in with a higher amount. Placket is in support of the measure and will work in support of it. She felt that with a higher amount there would be more leadership in the citizen's advisory committee if a bigger and bolder step is taken.

Snodgrass responded that the figure is a firm figure and the Board is not looking at the Council reducing the amount. The Board will strongly advocate, to Council, a strong figure. It is the responsibility of the Board to look at the entire City and to take into account citizens' support.

Kelsey has worked with Trust for Public Lands (TPL) and added that the Board hired them to find out what the community would support. The Board chose to follow TPL's recommendation and decided that the proposed figure would most likely be the best one to present to the community for the funds that would be available at this time. The Board has asked Council for additional CIP funds for the past 8 years without success.

Hopkins summarized the discussion noting that the Board took several steps in the program to initiate research: as follows:

- Updated PRO Plan
- Prepared the City's first Parks Improvement Plan (PIP)
- Looked at Strengths, and Weaknesses, and Opportunities (SWOT) at the neighborhood level
- Revised PRO Plan to look at realistic needs - both short and long term for the Parks system
- Maximized resources

- Re-evaluate CIP - 3 times to capture capital dollars to do projects that maximized the use of parks facilities, show responsibility, strengthen partnerships with the school district and initiate planning studies (e.g., GrassLawn, Idylwood Opportunity Study, Municipal Campus, Central Park and artificial turf)
- Went out to community to determine community support (PRO Plan and Bond Surveys)
- Secured bond consultant with extensive experience and proven track record

Motion by: Kelsey to approve the recommendation, put into final form with no sustenance changes and with Chair approval before taken to the joint City Council/Park Board meeting.

Second by: Stewart.

Approved: 4-0

VI. New Business

A. Anderson Park Water Source Improvement Project - Dennis Brunelle, Public Works, Sr. Project Manager

Brunelle brought a model of the park to scale to show the building in perspective to the Park. Brunelle then gave the Board an update on the Anderson Park Water Source Improvement project:

- The renovation and improvement of all the wells is called a source improvement project
- Currently the wells are in poor condition, need to be retrofitted, and do not meet current uniform building code requirements on safety.
- Anderson Park holds two wells; Wells 1 (adjacent to picnic shelter) & Well 2 (100' feet from 168th) - all water treatment is located in these two buildings. Caustic soda, chlorine gas, fluoride is used. These buildings will be replaced with new pump houses, same location as existing pump house buildings.
- These two wells are the biggest producing wells in the City.
- Biggest source improvement project of the five existing wells in the City of Redmond.
- Project started in 1993.

- 2004 two new well shafts were put down at Anderson Park to replace the existing casings
- Five years ago it was decided that the treatment building would be put in the park (northeast corner). Northwest corner gives access to the street for delivery of chemicals (salt and fluoride) to wells.
- Elimination of chlorine gas or caustic soda is a positive. Hypochloride will be generated onsite
- PAC tower function - water rains down inside the cylinder, sifting through plastic membranes which aerate the water to adjust the PH. Treatment for both wells will be combined into the one facility.
- The treatment facility, from its' originally plan has grown.
- Brunelle asked the Park Board to address the issues of the treatment facility, not the site. The entire site would be evaluated at a future meeting.
- Homeland Security regulations need to be taken into consideration and followed. These areas are now classified as secured facilities and must be open to view (fences, wiring around buildings or open for clear visibility).
- Building location would include footprint of the existing picnic shelter site, approximately 68'x32'. The new building will be almost twice the size of the existing picnic shelter on site.
- If the PAC Tower is placed inside the building the dimensions of the building will be 68'x40'. Another alternative is to place the PAC Tower outside the building (stand alone) for a dimension of 54'x40'. The tower is 16' in diameter. A separate tower and building would allow for more flexibility for placement in close proximity to the building. There will be fans and conduits connecting the tower and the building. 15' flexibility north and south with the structure itself.
- Public Works staff and HDR Engineering Consultants prefer the alternative where the PAC Tower is separate from the building.
- The building will not have any windows in it, glass block will allow light to enter the building.
- Building would be located at the northeast corner of the Park.
- There are variations on the shape of the tower.
- New pumps may not be able to interchange off new wells, which would add to the cost.
- Mitigation efforts and other enhancements to the Park will be discussed at the next Board meeting.
- Brunelle is asking Board members to discuss and select one of the two concepts presented.

Site specifics included:

- Anderson Park has historical resources on-site.
- Mature trees occur at proposed building site.
- Tree removal impacts for both design concepts are almost identical. A tree health study is being done by an "in house" arborist and outside consultant. Nine affected trees on site will be evaluated for health, diseases and stability. Those trees that are not sound will be removed for safety reasons.

Hopkins reiterated information from previous meetings regarding the project:

- Decision was made to partner with Public Works on the water treatment facility.
- The building has been enlarged from previously seen plans and from the original concept.
- Mission of the Park Board and intent of co-venturing with Public Works - Anderson Park is an historical site, housing two historical cabins.
- Public Works staff and consultants are looking for a decision on a proposed building concept so they can move forward.
- The Board must try to strike a balance to provide for the public utility; Provide for the security issue; impact on trees on site; esthetics - does it blend in to the site; what value does Public Works have as far as responsibility to invest in the park to make it work.
- Consider elevations.
- Separateness of tower - concept would incrementally affect the impact of the building.

The Board had questions directed to staff and consultants:

- Zak - As a downtown park it would seem odd to have a barn type structure with a silo in the middle of Redmond - chose concept 1A.
- Kelsey -
 - (Q) Is width on Concept #1 narrower than Concept #2?
(A) Profile is identical on both
 - (Q) Length shorter on building with tower outside?
(A) Yes, approximately 16'
 - (Q) Thoughts on types of materials used on outside of building, roof, tower

- (A) Based on previous review. Materials will be a spin-off of the existing buildings on-site. Roof will be shake-like material. Initially, looked at a log cabin type exterior.
- (Q) Types of materials used to simulate the already cabin type exteriors on site
(A) Peeled logs, sliced in 1/2. Problem is getting good quality logs that can be consistently sliced. Trying to keep the general nature of the wood.
 - (Q) It appears that existing trees will need to be limbed to a height of 32' for visual requirements by security.
(A) Most of the trees are limbed to 32' already. Remaining trees will probably not need to be limbed up.
 - (Q) In regards to security, is it possible to put in low shrubbery around the buildings?
(A) Yes, two feet or less with separation from building. There will be monitoring systems onsite. No shrubbery too close to building to conceal a person to prevent forced entry into the building.
 - (Q) Noise - new design, new filtration system, what will the noise level be?
(A) There will be more noise - wind noise. Roof of tower, corrugated, open to help alleviate some noise. Meets noise standards.
- Snodgrass:
 - (Q) Second set of drawings had dormers on the roof sidelines. Are side dormers possible? May visually break up the 68' length - visually break up massive length.
(A) Yes, dormers are possible. However, they do not serve any specific purpose.
 - (Q) Option #2 - detached silo, the connecting piece, how tall?
(A) 10'.
 - (Q) Concern about "attractive nuisance"? Climb, graffiti.
(A) The enclosure on the tower can be a non-climbing material - uninviting to climb. Options are being investigated.
 - (Q) Can the building be lowered into the ground?
(A) No, the aquifer is too shallow.

Snodgrass commented that depending how sited, visually the sight line to the playground will be blocked, which would cause safety concerns and other issues. She also added that buildings should be at the minimum square footage.

Brunelle reiterated the process which the project would move forward:

- Board selects preferred building structure
- Executive meeting with Mayor Ives
- Back to Board - access, setting, entire park, orientation, site lines - difficulties, relocation of playground if deemed appropriate

Hopkins added that, from the Park Director's stand point, Public Works will have to satisfy the Board, Council, Mayor and the community at large. Public Works will be making a substantial monetary investment to make this project work for everyone involved.

Kelsey asked what the projected lifetime for the facilities. Brunelle noted that as planned, minimum 50 year system, expected to meet all the requirements under UVC, Safe Drinking Water Act, DOD, and DOH requirements for the next 50 years and expected to exceed those 50 years by 30 years.

Snodgrass asked Board members to voice their opinion and make a suggestion as to what building plan/alternative they preferred.

- Stewart - Alt. 1 (would like to revisit earlier concepts - roof line and dormers). Stand alone can invite vandalism dependant upon where the silo is located. Also, dependant where the silo and building is located could increase the width of the site line.
- Margeson - Alt. 2
- Kelsey - Alt. 2 (flexibility as to where to move the silo in regards to building)
- Zak - Alt. 1
- Snodgrass - Alt. 2 - more character indusive - need better review of the drawing, more can be done to make it more of a barn character, providing more visual see through, shift to church side rather than park side. The massiveness of the structure at the park and character of park will be something of an issue, third time presented to Park Board over the past five years, and each time the project becomes larger and more massive - concerns that the Board is still being told that the footprint can change, losing a valuable asset downtown, need to make efforts to preserve the quality and character of park. How many trees are being affected? Cannot provide intelligent feedback due to the vagueness of the actual physical impact on the park site.

Brunelle responded that trees have been pinpointed and are being health evaluated/assessed. Upon completion a copy will be forwarded to Board members. Placement of buildings are dependant upon tree study. Snodgrass suggested the area should be flagged/marked and requested a visual impact report given to the Board as soon as possible.

Hopkins summarized that the Board had agreed on Option #2. Parks and Recreation staff members are in alignment with the Board's concerns. New technology and benefits to the community should not come at the expense of the parks system. The compensation for this type of project and the impact is something that needs to be addressed aggressively in obtaining some compensation and equity to the parks system.

B. Land Acquisition Needs Discussion - Handout

Hopkins handed out a copy of the Park Improvement Plan on the land acquisitions. Staff's next goal is to make a comprehensive map with all properties or areas where all properties are located on the list. Current land acquisition strategies has had some tenants, adjacent to Parks, trail, land acquisition for trail completion and connections, environmentally sensitive lands, high priority neighborhood parks to meet service delivery discussed in the Pro Plan. The maps would assist staff and Board members a chance to get more pro-active, rather than re-active. This will guide land acquisition funding and CIP funding. The goal is to have, in two or three months, a comprehensive map that identifies acquisition properties.

C. Sammamish Valley SWOT Introduction

Staff will be coming back with some preliminary evaluations for the Board at July's meeting; administrative recommendations will be made and brought back to the Board in August.

VII. Reports - Projects

A. Williams Pipeline Replacement
Paper report to be distributed.

B. Idylwood Park
In process of waiting for a support hold assembly. The earthwork has been completed and foundation poured.

D. Derby Days

The Board will be notified via e-mail on the shared booth at Derby Days with Arts Commission. Volunteers are needed. For discussion at the next Board meeting. Possibility of getting RYPAC volunteers to staff a booth.

E. Park Board Vacancies

Still looking for interested persons to fill two vacancies on the Board.

VIII. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn: Stewart
Second by: Margeson
Approved: 4-0

Meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

By: _____ Date _____
Lori Snodgrass, Chair

Minutes prepared by Recording Secretary, Sharon Sato

Next Regular Meeting
August 4, 2005
7:00 p.m.
Location: Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center